

a radio control interface, configured to receive commands from a radio controller unit;

a process control arrangement, coupled to receive speed information regarding the rotational velocity of the motor and configured and arranged to generate a plurality of motor control signals based upon a combination of a plurality of speed feedback control signals and pulse width modulation signal;

*CI
Caid.
sub.
221*

a motor control arrangement, including a nonvolatile memory responsive to the process control arrangement, the memory configured and arranged to store user-defined information to provide user-defined information to the process control arrangement and the user defined information comprises a mapping of a motor rotational speed to a land speed on the train, the motor control arrangement responsive to the motor control signals and coupled to receive power from the power arrangement and configured and arranged to supply power to the motor at different times based on the motor control signals; and

a sound information arrangement, operatively coupled to receive rotational speed and positional information from the motor and to provide the rotational speed and positional information to a sound control arrangement for simulating railroad sounds; and ✓

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed second April 4, 2002. With July 4, 2002 being a legal holiday, response is due on or before July 5, 2002. Claims 18-35 are now pending.

Applicant requests that the Attorney docket be changed to LLT-259-B.

Claims 18-24, 26-28, 30 and 31 stand rejected. The Examiner has indicated that claims 25, 29 and 32 include allowable subject matter but are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants have added new claims 33-35 which correspond to dependent claims 25, 29 and 32 rewritten as independent claims and including all limitations from the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant's new claims 33-35 have been slightly rewritten however for grammatical clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 18-24, 26-28, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,555,815) and Melocik et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,567,757). The Examiner states that Young discloses a control system for a model vehicle on a track wherein the model system generates force for propelling the train. The Examiner states that Young et al. teach a locomotive, driven along a track by a transformer that includes a horn button, an offset sensor coupled to the power rail, a sound generating unit, a backup power source, a speed sensor and a sound memory arrangement which varies sound depending on speed. The Examiner states that Melocik et al. teach an apparatus in conjunction with a vehicle. Among other things the Examiner states the Melocik reference teaches "A traction motor connected to the power source and to the vehicle wheels. Wherein, a predetermined amount of power from the source is delivered to the traction motor for a predetermined period of time in response to received wheel rotational signal from the transducer; ...". The Examiner's comments identify locations from the Melocik reference where the referenced teachings are found.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has mischaracterized the Melocik reference. The Examiner states that Melocik teaches a predetermined amount of power from the power source is delivered to the traction motor for a predetermined period of time in response to received wheel rotational signal from the transducer. The passages referenced by the Examiner indicate that Melocik et al. teaches that a brakes status signal is produced in response to the amount of wheel rotation. Applicant respectfully points out that the Abstract of Melocik states:

a predetermined amount of power from the power source is delivered to the traction motor for a predetermined period of **time**. **In** response to receiving wheel rotational signals from the transducer, the processor determines the degree of rotation of the vehicle wheels during at least a predetermined portion of the period of time that the traction motor is energized, and produces a brake status signal in response to amount of rotation of the vehicle wheels. (Emphasis added).

Applicant believes the Examiner has inadvertently read these two sentences as a single sentence. Read as separate sentences, it is clear that Melocik et al. teach that the degree of rotation information may be used to actuate a brake status signal and does not teach "a predetermined amount of power from the power source is delivered to the traction motor for a predetermined period of time in response to received wheel rotational signal from the transducer."

Claim 18 includes a control arrangement, coupled to the transducer to receive rotational information configured and arranged to cause power to be applied to the motor at different times based on at least the rotational information provided by the transducer. Independent claim 26 includes a control arrangement operative to detect available track voltage and coupled to receive the rotational speed information from the transducer, the controller being configured and arranged to apply a percentage of the available track voltage to the motor and apply a greater percentage of the track voltage to the motor in response to the signal from the transducer characteristic of a decrease in the rotational speed of the motor. Melocik does not include this teaching. The Examiner's statement that Melocik teaches that a predetermined amount of power from the power source is delivered to the traction motor for a predetermined period of time in response to received wheel rotational signal from the transducer is erroneous. Dependent claims 19 through 25 and 27-32 include additional patentable features and are similarly allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejecting of claims 18-24, 26-28 and 30 and 31 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment traverses and overcomes all the Examiner's objections and rejections to the application as filed. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment places the application in suitable condition for allowance, notice of which is requested. If the Examiner feels that the prosecution of the present application can be expedited by way of Examiner's Amendment or telephonic conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & BASILE, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'TEB', is written over the printed name of Thomas E. Bejin.

Thomas E. Bejin
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,089
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107

Dated: July 5, 2002
TEB/sld